

*Recovery of amounts from
Sri U. K. Somappa.*

Q.—329. Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether Sri U. K. Somappa, Senior Deputy Inspector-General of Police, was compulsorily retired from service and, if so, when and why?

(b) whether any Government Order had been passed directing the recovery of any moneys from Sri U. K. Somappa and, if so, the amount together with the reasons for directing its recovery from him;

(c) how this amount was ascertained and by whom and what it represented;

(d) whether Government have reconsidered the matter upon a petition presented by this person;

(e) the procedure adopted by Government in dealing with this matter upon the petition for reconsideration;

(f) whether it is a fact that Government have ordered that no recovery need be made and, if so, upon what considerations;

(g) whether the Director of Anti-Corruption and Efficiency Audit was invited to examine the matter and, if so, the result of such examination or each such examination?

A.—Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—

(a) Yes, with effect from 4th January 1952, on account of maladministration of the Office of the Senior Deputy Inspector-General of Police.

(b) Yes, a sum of Rs. 24,946-12-6 was directed to be recovered from Sri U. K. Somappa, for having been responsible for misappropriation to that extent.

(c) This amount was determined as misappropriated by the Director of Efficiency Audit and Anti-Corruption after going through the accounts of the Office of the Senior Deputy Inspector-General.

(d) Yes.

(e) This matter was again referred to the Special Officer, Efficiency Audit and orders passed on his report.

(f) Yes, as there was no evidence to indicate that Sri U. K. Somappa himself misappropriated the money and the only charge against him was gross negligence in the administration of his office.

(g) Yes, a sum of Rs. 24,946-12-6 was ordered to be recovered from Sri U. K. Somappa on the findings of the Director of Anti-Corruption and Efficiency Audit in the first instance and he recommended for the recovery of a lesser amount subsequently.

PROGRAMME OF BUSINESS FOR THE
SESSION.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, regarding the programme fixed for the Session, if the Chair permits me, I want to bring to the notice of the Leader of the House one or two points.

As you know, Sir, only one day has been allotted for the consideration of demands and supplementary grants. Yesterday the Chief Minister was pleased to present the Supplementary Estimate and it is so voluminous and important and it is as big and as important as the original budget.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—It is very simple.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the previous occasion also only one day was allotted.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Now it is very important because the demand for the transferred area has been placed before us for the first time and many issues are raised. The amount and the number of Heads of Demands placed before us are really out of proportion. It can be taken as good as a regular budget. So, I request that more days be allotted as I expect a large number of cut motions. We need five days, seeing the number of cut motions and the

nature of the discussion and the important issues that will be raised and to do full justice.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I submit, and I hope my friend will agree, that this is a short session and whatever has to be done, we have to do within the time fixed. Many Hon'ble Members of this House have got other engagements and therefore it would not be possible for us to extend the time.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In that case, we will be failing in our duty and we will not be doing justice to the Supplementary Demands. One day is hopelessly insufficient.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I leave it to your discretion. As circumstances are, Sir, many members of the House have got other engagements to go to various places. Informally I discussed this with many members of this House. Many of them say that they have previously fixed engagements at Calcutta and other places. So, it is not possible for me to concede to the request of the Leader of the Opposition for five days.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose the Hon'ble Members are willing to work on Sunday also?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I leave it to the discretion of the Chair.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—If it is only a day, this side of us may not take part in the discussion unless full time is given to us.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, it would not be right to do anything under pressure and threat. Therefore, it is a question of persuasion. I said I leave it to the discretion of the Chair to give a little more time, if it is possible, say half a day or so.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ನಾಗರ-ಹೊಸ ನಗರ).—ಇದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವಸರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕು ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಧಾನ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition wants five days at

least. We have set apart only one day. One day will not be sufficient, he says, as the amount before them is 3 crores and odd. I would like to know the opinion of the House.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—The amount of criticism or otherwise does not depend on the quantum of money required, but it depends on the merit. It is no good stipulating extension at this stage. Day after and the day after we can devote some time for the discussion on the Motion of Thanks. Sri Imam can cover some of the items while discussing that subject. Perhaps he can draw the attention of Government to some of the points raised in the speech of His Highness. For supplementary grants it is usually one day that is allotted.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Chennagiri).—Under usual circumstances.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I believe, Sir, no unusual circumstance has arisen now. The Leader of the Opposition must bear in mind Kalyani Session near Calcutta. After discussion is over for a day, then we can think of granting a little more time. The Leader of the House has said that half a day may be allotted. I think this will be all right.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—We can also sit for longer hours if it is necessary.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—No, because the Chair will apply guillotine according to the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will consider this on Saturday. As per the programme, it is to be taken on the 18th. On 16th we will decide.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಕೂಡ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೊಂದು ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶಬೇಕು. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಅವರು ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಿ ಸೆಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಯಾವ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಆ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿಯುವ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಉಚಿತ ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—This can be considered on Saturday as you said.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Quite so. Now consideration of Bills.

MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move :

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration.”

Sir, this is a Bill about an Act that has been in force in Madras for quite a few years and naturally it applied to the District of Bellary also. It was due to expire on 2nd December 1953 and since the legislature was not in session, it was considered necessary that an ordinance should issue, and consequently the Mysore Ordinance No. 2 of 1953 was promulgated for the purpose. Now, this Act is intended to repeal the Ordinance. The purpose of this Bill, I might mention here, which was in operation in Madras in the old Madras area, was to protect private forests from being ruined by illicit cutting. The old Madras Government had enacted this Act and one of the important provisions of this Act was that no private individual who owns more than 100 acres can cut trees in his forest without the permission of the Government, which is usually obtained from the District Collector. In Bellary there are a few areas which come under the provisions of this Act. Now, till such time as the Mysore Acts are brought into force in Bellary area, it is necessary to have this Act in operation. It is provided in this Bill that is now before you, to keep this Act in force in Bellary area only for one year. Therefore, the suggestion is that the figure 1953 in the old Act be changed to the figure 1954. It is a very simple

Bill and I commend this to your consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration.”

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavan-gudi).—I want some information, Sir. Have we got the Madras Act before us? Is it circulated here? This is an amendment of the Madras Act. Has that Act been circulated among the members, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is an Act which is available in the Library. Generally Acts are not distributed.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—It was stated that it is considered necessary to extend the duration of the Act for a period of one year and therefore the substitution of the figures 1954 for the figures 1953 be made. May I know, Sir, why it is considered necessary to extend the duration of the Act by only one year and whether Government do not consider it necessary to keep this Act in force for the preservation of private forests for a period beyond the period of one year or whether it is their intention or their expectation that these private forests would have been completely exploited at the end of that period of one year?

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—No, Sir. It is not the intention of the Government nor is it their idea that the private forests would be exploited within the course of one year or there would not be any necessity for the continuation of a provision like this. But, probably in the course of this year many of the Acts that are now in force in Bellary will have to be repealed and Mysore Act or new Acts to be brought into force to that area. So, it was thought enough if we can have this Act in force only for a short period. That is the simplest amendment that could be made to the existing Act.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Is it the Mysore enactment that would be